

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

TITUS HENDERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

CATHY A. JESS, TIM HAINES, L.R. IVERSON,
VICKI SEBASTAIN, PETER HUIBREGTSE,
T. OVERBO, CHAPLAIN EWING, G. BOUGHTON,
A. BROADBENT, and CO II BARTELS,

18-cv-680-jdp

Defendants.

Plaintiff Titus Henderson, appearing pro se, is an inmate at Green Bay Correctional Institution. He alleges that defendant prison officials denied him religious meals and property. I granted him leave to proceed on claims under the First Amendment, Eighth Amendment, Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act. *See* Dkt. 9.

Henderson has filed a motion for reconsideration of my order screening the complaint. I will deny Henderson's motion because he has not pointed out any claims that I missed. He states that the screening order did not include a discussion of an Eighth Amendment claim for denial of food during Ramadan. But I did discuss that type of claim and allow him to proceed on Eighth Amendment claims against defendants Jess, Overbo, Huibregtse, Haines, Boughton, Sebastian, Ewing, Broadbent, and Bartels for denying him meals. *Id.* at 7–8.

Similarly, Henderson says that I did not explain how the denial of food during Ramadan violated RLUIPA. But I stated that Henderson could proceed on RLUIPA claims for the same reasons that he could bring free-exercise claims under the First Amendment. *Id.* at 6. One of those claims is that defendants denied him religious meals. *Id.* at 4.

Henderson also states that he is not allowed to use the e-filing program at GBCI because the warden makes him use a pencil or crayon, which is difficult for the e-filing scanners to pick up. If Henderson believes that this decision has violated his rights, he needs to raise it in a separate lawsuit. If what he means is that his right of access to the courts is being violated, I could consider that issue within this lawsuit. But this does not appear to be a problem that requires court intervention. Henderson is still able to mail documents to the court, as he would have to if he were at a prison that is not part of the e-filing program.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Titus Henderson's motion for reconsideration of the court's October 25, 2018 order screening his complaint, Dkt. 22, is DENIED.

Entered February 27, 2019.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

JAMES D. PETERSON
District Judge